

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for courtesies extended in the telephone interview of June 11, 2008 and for carefully considering this application.

Interview Summary

An interview was conducted on June 11, 2008 with Examiner Okoronkwo. Briefly, the pending claims and currently cited prior art were discussed. No agreement was reached. An Interview Summary was issued on June 18, 2008. Applicants have reviewed the Interview Summary and agree with its contents.

Disposition of the Claims

Claims 27-47 are pending in the application. Claims 27, 34, and 41 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 27, 34, and 41.

Claim Amendments

Claims 27-29, 34-35, and 41-42 have been amended by this reply. No new matter by way of these amendments. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, in pages 22-24 and 34-38 of the Specification.

Drawings

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate whether the replacement drawings filed July 6, 2007 are acceptable.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 27-31, 33-35, 37-45, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being disclosed by U.S. Patent No. 7,010,582 ("Cheng"). To the extent that this rejection applies to the amended pending claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 27 is directed to a method for managing access to a plurality of applications using artifacts and identity assertion information. More specifically, claim 27 requires, in part, (i) authenticating a user using a user name and password to a first application; (ii) generating identity assertion information based the successful authentication for use by a plurality of applications to authenticate the user; (iii) providing the first application with a first artifact, where the first artifact is used to obtain the identity assertion information; (iv) providing the first artifact to a second application, where the second application uses the first artifact to obtain the identity assertion information; (v) authenticating the user using the identity assertion information to the second application; (vi) generating a second artifact, where the first artifact is used to obtain the identity assertion information (*i.e.*, the same identity assertion information mentioned in (iii)); and (v) rendering the first artifact invalid for future use by any of the plurality of applications.

Turning to the rejection, "[a] claim is anticipated only if *each and every element* as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (emphasis

added). Further, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicants assert that Cheng fails to disclose all the limitations of the pending independent claims. Specifically, Cheng discloses an authentication front-end configured to receive a request to access a protected URL, where the request may contain a cookie. *See* Cheng col. 6 lines 38-48. After authentication, a cookie is sent back to the user with redirect instructions to the protected URL that the user initially requested. The user may then use this cookie to access other servers within the domain. Accordingly, the cookie is (i) maintained by the user (or more specifically in the end user device); (ii) the cookie may be reused to access different servers; (iii) the cookie is used to directly authenticate the user to the server.

The Examiner has attempted to equate cookie disclosed in Cheng to artifacts of the amended claims. The Applicants disagree. Specifically, artifacts may only be used for a single authentication; (ii) artifacts themselves do not grant authenticate a user to an application; rather, the artifact is used to obtain the identity assertion information that is used to authenticate the user to the application; and (iii) the artifact is used to obtain the identity assertion information while the cookie in Cheng is not used to obtain any sort of information required for authentication as the cookie itself is provided for the purpose of authenticating the user.

In view of the above, Cheng fails to disclose all the limitations of amended claim 27. Accordingly claims 27 and claims depending therefrom are patentable over Cheng. Further, amended independent claims 34 and 40 include similar patentable limitations. Accordingly, claims 34 and 40, and claims depending therefrom patentable over Cheng. In view of the above, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 32, 36, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0177388 ("Botz"). To the extent that this rejection applies to the remaining pending claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

MPEP § 2143 states that "[t]he key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. The Supreme Court in KSR noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit." Further, when combining prior art elements, the Examiner "must articulate the following: (1) a finding that the prior art included each element claimed, although not necessarily in a single prior art reference, with the only difference between the claimed invention and the prior art being the lack of actual combination of the elements in a single prior art reference...." MPEP § 2143(A).

Claims 32, 36, and 46 depend on independent claims 27, 34, and 40 respectively. As discussed above, Cheng fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of amended independent claims 27, 34, and 40. Further, Botz fails to teach or suggest that which Cheng lacks. This is evidenced by the fact that Botz is only relied upon to teach SAML and that the identity assertion information is stored in the identity service provider. *See* Office Action mailed March 27, 2008, p. 7.

In view of the above, amended independent claims are patentable over Cheng and Botz, whether viewed separately or in combination. Dependent claims are patentable over Cheng and Botz for at least the same reasons. Accordingly withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants believe this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 03226/475001; P8956).

Dated: June 27, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Robert P. Lord/
Robert P. Lord
Registration No.: 46,479
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicants

369967_1